

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION

ANGEL L. TORRES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:22-cv-1298-WWB-LHP

JIM ZINGALE, ANDREA
MORELAND, LISA VICKERS,
CLARK ROGERS, ANN COFFIN,
TIFFANY MOORE RUSSELL,
SUPPORT MAGISTRATES OFFICE,
STATE ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
JUDITH ROMAN and OFFICE OF
CLERK OF COURT,

Defendants

ORDER

This cause came on for consideration without oral argument on the following
motion filed herein:

**MOTION: MOTION FOR NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CASE #
DR-10-1262 FROM STATE COUNTY COURT TO
FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT FOR FEDERAL
QUESTION JURISDICTION ACCORDING TO F.R.P.
RULE 1.06 WITH INCORPORATED
MEMORANDUM OF LAW (Doc. No. 95)**

FILED: August 23, 2023

THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED as moot.

Plaintiff has filed an amended motion (Doc. No. 96).

**MOTION: MOTION FOR NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF CASE #
DR-10-1262 FROM STATE COUNTY COURT TO
FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT FOR FEDERAL
QUESTION JURISDICTION ACCORDING TO F.R.P.
RULE 1.06 WITH INCORPORATED
MEMORANDUM OF LAW (Doc. No. 96)**

FILED: August 24, 2023

**THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED without
prejudice.**

The motion fails to comply with Local Rule 3.01(g)(3), which requires a party to try diligently for three days to contact the opposing party after filing the motion and requires the movant to supplement the motion with a statement certifying whether the parties have resolved all or part of the motion. "Failure to timely supplement can result in denial of the motion without prejudice." Local Rule 3.01(g)(3), M.D. Fla. Moreover, Plaintiff has not provided any legal authority or explanation as to how this Court would have jurisdiction over what appears to be a now final judgment in state court.

**MOTION: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REQUEST FOR A
PERMISSIVE JOINDER OF ALL THE DEFENDANTS
NAMED HEREIN IN ACCORDANCE WITH F.R.C.P.
20(2)(A)(B) (Doc. No. 101)**

FILED: September 22, 2023

THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.

Although this motion complies with Local Rule 3.01(g), and appears to be unopposed given the lack of a timely response by any Defendant, *see* Local Rule 3.01(a), the motion is still due to be denied. Plaintiff seeks to join “all Defendants named herein,” but Plaintiff has already filed a complaint listing as Defendants all named parties, therefore it is entirely unclear from the motion the relief Plaintiff seeks. Doc. No. 101. Nor does Plaintiff explain how Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 20, which governs the joinder of parties not already part of the case, applies here. Moreover, to the extent Plaintiff references the Court’s prior orders permitting the Defendants that have appeared in this case to join in the same motion to dismiss, *see* Doc. No. 100, that relief was not granted pursuant to Rule 20, but rather for purposes of judicial and attorney efficiency. Unless Plaintiff affirmatively represents to the contrary, the Court already treats any motions Plaintiff files as pertaining to all Defendants that have appeared in this case to date.

DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on October 24, 2023.



LESLIE HOFFMAN PRICE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Parties